

From: ehud barak <ehbarak1@gmail.com>
To: Joshua Hantman <hantman.joshua@gmail.com>
CC:
Date: Sat, 5/18/2013 1:41:44 PM
Subject: Re: Marvin etc

On May 14, 2013, at 6:40 PM, Joshua Hantman <hantman.joshua@gmail.com> wrote:

לתיקונים/אישורך...

josh

I've tried to make it more concise and clear. you can send it in this version only. thanks. Ehud,

Hi Marvin,

Sorry it took a while to respond. In response to your questions:

We never mentioned nuclear weapons in regard to the idea of defence treaty and strongly recommend that you will not raise it.

when as a newly elected Prime Minister I've started strategic discussions with President Clinton in 1999 we already had peace with Egypt an Jordan. I've already stated publicly that i intend to pull out of Lebanon within a year and give a sincere effort to strike a deal with Assad and reach an Agreement, if possible, with Arafat. we sat down for many hours one on one with President Clinton and try to illustrate the priorities ,alternatives and the best way to try to achieve results before the end of his 2nd term. it is within this wide context that the question of whether an American readiness to consider a defines treaty with Israel can help in shaping a viable strategy and if so, when and how to raise it. to tell the truth, and it is a great compliment in my judgment, Clinton never swayed or blinked in regard to those principles that we've agreed upon. and never lost the determination to try and reach the Peace in the region.when such a peace will be achieved ,whether it takes five fifteen or fifty years it will look almost exactly as the plan we have proposed

The idea of USIL defence treaty was not totally new,both Israel and the U.S. have already rejected the idea as an optimal one *before* a final peace treaty with ALL neighbours will be achieved . It has been raised and briefly discussed several times in the past, and once and again rejected, by both sides.

The U.S., mainly legal advisers, rejected it arguing that the US cannot sign a defense treaty with a country that does not have recognized borders. When would it be activated? Congress can not pass it. It simply did not make sense from a legal point of view.

Israel usually rejected it; but for different reasons. first of all we felt that our security as a sovereign state should first and foremost be defended by Israel itself.thats why we established it to start with.but even on practical ground in regard to negotiations, If we have anything that looks like a full guarantee from the U.S., then our negotiating position is weakened. We have security demands on the ground that will be undermined

because the other side might claim that the Treaty makes the security arrangements redundant.

Therefore it was important to cover *all* of the issues with the Palestinians: Borders, the finality of claims, the recognition of the Arab world, Israel's security needs etc. Then, or preferably even before the Palestinians, to complete an agreement with Syria and as a by product with Lebanon as well. Only then, if all the above succeed, and it was a big if in our judgment even in 2000, would it be possible to have a defense treaty with the U.S., as a final guarantee of the peace treaty.

I told Clinton, that *if* we could finalize a peace agreement with the Palestinians, with Syria, and as a result with Lebanon... only *then* should we cap this peace agreement with a defense treaty with the U.S. as an extra guarantee.

It [the defense treaty] would also serve as an ultimate answer to criticism from within. We live in a democracy and criticism is inevitable. Life is full of built in uncertainties. When you sign an agreement you, of course, take risks; the defense treaty – on top of the security arrangements within the peace treaty – would serve to solidify the agreement and convince the critics within Israeli public of the viability of the set of peace agreements as a whole.

On Tue, May 14, 2013 at 11:27 AM, ehud barak <ehbarak1@gmail.com> wrote:
I'm back in IL. Pl call. EB

Sent from my iPhone

On May 4, 2013, at 10:52, Josh Hantman <hantman.joshua@gmail.com> wrote:

No prob.

What's the best number to get you on?
What time are you free?

ב- May 4, 2013, 4:22 בשעה, ehud barak <ehbarak1@gmail.com> כתב/ה:

Dear Josh
Re Marvin: will do it today.
Re 1Fam : they'll have to approach my agent. Don Walker. At Harry Walker Agency. He'll make the decision.
Best
EB

Sent from my iPhone

On May 3, 2013, at 23:51, Josh Hantman
<hantman.joshua@gmail.com> wrote:

Shabbat Shalom EB.

A couple of issues:

1) We still need to sort out Marvin's answers.

2) One Family UK would love for you to speak to them in June - they have a tight budget, but they are a very worthwhile organization. I can help arrange if you're interested...

Pls let me know,

Josh